

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 08/07/2003 Gerard MacNeil 6337.1041 9853 10/635,566 **EXAMINER** 7590 02/23/2006 Geoffrey R. Myers, Esquire STINSON, FRANKIE L Hall, Priddy, Myers & Vande Sande PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT Ste. 200

10220 River Road 1746
Potomac, MD 20854
DATE MAILED: 02/23/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A
Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/635,566	MACNEIL ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	FRANKIE L. STINSON	1746
The MAILING DATE of this communication Period for Reply	appears on the cover sheet with	the correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR RE WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFr after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period for reply will, by standard to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by standard patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	G DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA R 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rept riod will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH atute, cause the application to become ABAN	ATION. y be timely filed IS from the mailing date of this communication. IDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 0	9 January 2005.	
	This action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allo	wance except for formal matter	s, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice und	er <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 1	11, 453 O.G. 213.
Disposition of Claims		
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4 and 12-14</u> is/are pending in th	e application.	
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are with	drawn from consideration.	
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.		
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-4</u> is/are rejected.		
7) Claim(s) <u>12-14</u> is/are objected to.		
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction an	d/or election requirement.	
Application Papers		
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Exam	niner.	
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ a	accepted or b) objected to by	the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to	-, ,	* *
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the cor	, ,,	,
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attached C	Office Action or form PTO-152.
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for forea) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:	eign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 1	19(a)-(d) or (f).
1. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received.	
2. Certified copies of the priority docum	ents have been received in App	olication No
3. Copies of the certified copies of the p	· · · · · · ·	ceived in this National Stage
application from the International Bur	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	
* See the attached detailed Office action for a	list of the certified copies not re	ceived.
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) 🗖 Intentiew Sun	nmary (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Mail Date

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-326 (Rev. 7-05)

Paper No(s)/Mail Date ___

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: ____.

Application/Control Number: 10/635,566

Art Unit: 1746

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

Page 2

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 2. Claims 1-4 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,550,485.

 Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the jets inherently emit a jet of fluid against the interior surface of the sewer and the vehicle is to be moved along the length of the sewer, which is a longitudinal parallel movement.
- 3. Claims 12-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FRANKIE L. STINSON whose telephone number is (571) 272-1308. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F from 5:30 am to 2:00 pm and some Saturdays from approximately 5:30 am to 11:30 am.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Michael Barr, can be reached on (571) 272-1700. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-272-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

fls

FRANKIE L. STINSON
Primary Examiner
GROUP ART UNIT 1746